



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

somewhat discursive essays dealing pleasantly and instructively with the subjects of which it treats, while still leaving open the field for a more scientific study of the subject.

The Hayes-Tilden Disputed Presidential Election of 1876. By PAUL LELAND HAWORTH, Lecturer in History, Columbia University. (Cleveland: The Burrows Brothers Company. 1906. Pp. xi, 365.)

MR. HAWORTH'S study of the disputed election of 1876 possesses nearly every virtue desirable in a historical work, with one exception. It is based upon an investigation of every possible printed or manuscript source, which, as the author says, may be deemed exhaustive; for, although other sources of information exist, there is little likelihood of their being divulged, since "those actors who could tell the truth . . . will never do so" (p. x). This mass of material has been subjected to an analysis whose minute caution and systematic verification of statements are visible on every page. The author uses foot-notes skilfully, so as to avoid cumbering the page with bulky references while substantiating every important assertion. The conviction is impressed upon the reader that Mr. Haworth, in the search for facts, has come as close to the truth of this exceedingly complicated affair as it is possible for one to attain by historical methods.

Another merit lies in the compact handling of material. In spite of the enormous bulk of his evidence, Mr. Haworth manages to compress every essential fact into 343 pages, leaving out details, yet including many interesting, significant, and amusing brief quotations. The style, too, is admirably clear and graphic. There are few books devoted to a single line of complicated and rather sordid politics which read as entertainingly, largely because of the lucidity and ease of presentation.

Mr. Haworth, in short, has produced what ought to be an authoritative account of the great contested election; yet in view of one peculiar feature of the book it may be doubted whether it can be regarded as final. The monograph is pervaded from cover to cover with a strong bias in favor of the Republican party and against the Democratic. The facts are not concealed or altered, the errors or questionable proceedings of Republicans are not ignored, and every opinion of the author is provided with some recognition of a possible alternative conclusion; but, from start to finish of the long, complicated, and malodorous story, it is perfectly obvious that in Mr. Haworth's eyes the Republican party was uniformly right and the Democratic party uniformly wrong.

The interpretation of the case, according to Mr. Haworth, may be easily summed up: the returning boards were partizan and shameless, but their decisions were within their legal powers and were equitably correct; the contentions of the Democrats against the validity of electoral votes were groundless; the Electoral Commission decided correctly both in law and in equity; the Republican contest to secure the count-

ing of the doubtful votes for Hayes was not a "plot"; the Democratic leaders, including Mr. Tilden, are proved by the "Cipher dispatches" to have attempted bribery; the bargain by which Hayes ceased to support the carpet-bag governments in Florida, South Carolina, and Louisiana, after securing their electoral votes, was proper and did not involve any real inconsistency.

The foregoing conclusions might of course be reached by a rigidly impartial judge through the weighing of evidence, but unfortunately it is the absence of impartiality which stands out prominently in Mr. Haworth's language and temper. They seem worthier indeed of 1866 than of 1906. All his praise is reserved for Republican leaders, all his sarcasm for their opponents. Tilden is mentioned only with a sneer. The speech of Jeremiah S. Black before the Electoral Commission is termed (p. 264) "a bitter invective, hardly to have been expected from the man who, in the greatest crisis of our 'history, had rendered to a weak President one of the . . . most unfortunate opinions ever given by a public officer." The Southern motive for attacking and terrifying negroes is said (pp. 82-83) to be the fact that "as the negro was now 'the nation's ward,' he was a convenient object on which the unthinking could vent their impotent hatred for the North". Mr. Haworth fairly gloats over the humiliation of South Carolina, even styling the carpet-bag abominations in that state "poetic justice" (p. 123), and picturing with evident satisfaction the situation of South Carolinians obliged to listen to "the strains of a song relating to a certain Brown late of Osawatomie" (p. 122).

Wherever Mr. Haworth admits any Republican error, he almost invariably offsets it by an allusion to an equivalent Democratic misdeemeanor. The Florida returning board, for instance, "did its work in an unpardonably partisan manner, though in so doing . . . it merely followed examples recently set by the Democratic majority in the national House of Representatives" (p. 67). Further, while admitting that all the returning boards altered returns to secure Republican majorities, Mr. Haworth considers that this was merely a recognition of the fact that in equity the states were Republican, owing to the existence of negro intimidation. "Had there been a fair and free election . . . there can be little if any doubt that the result . . . would have been favorable to Hayes" (p. 340). In short, the monograph is thoroughly scientific in method and sound in its criticism of fact, but is equally unscientific in spirit and temper. The style occasionally descends perilously near flippancy and vulgarity at the expense of Southern Democrats. What prevents this partizanship from damaging the work is the author's admirable clearness and comprehensiveness of research and his recognition that, for all his preferences, there were two sides to each question. Mr. Haworth's decisions are those of an "eight to seven" Republican, every time, but the evidence is fully given.